



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/695,972	10/29/2003	Michal Jacovi	IL920030021US1	7990
7590 11/06/2008				
Stephen C. Kaufman IBM Corporation Intellectual Property Law Dept. P.O. Box 218 Yorktown Heights, NY 10598				
EXAMINER				
YAARY, MICHAEL D				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2193				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/06/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/695,972

Applicant(s)

JACOVI ET AL.

Examiner

MICHAEL YAARY

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-25 and 37 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-25 and 37 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/06/2008
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 15-25 and 37 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 15 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruths et al. (hereafter Ruths)(US Pub. 2003/0018719) in view of Guthrie et al. (hereafter Guthrie)(US Pub. 2004/0158811).

4. Ruths was cited in the previous office action dated 04/04/2008.

5. **As to claims 15 and 37**, Ruths discloses a method comprising:

Enabling peer support for a user (abstract and [0011]), wherein said peer support is available from a universe of users with a commonality of interest with said user ([0011], lines 12-17); and enabling said user to communicate with at least one of said users ([0011], lines 12-17 and figure 2).

6. Ruths does not disclose the enabling is from within an integrated development environment (IDE), and wherein said commonality of interest is determined by at least one context of work within said IDE.

However, Guthrie discloses the enabling is from within an integrated development environment (IDE), and wherein said commonality of interest is determined by at least one context of work within said IDE (Abstract, [0026], and [0028] disclose an IDE environment allowing access to components to outside users from within the IDE).

7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Ruths by utilizing a user accessible integrated development environment, as taught by Guthrie, for the benefit of allowing access to components located remotely from directly within an IDE ([0010]).

8. Claims 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruths and Guthrie as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Fitzpatrick et al. (hereafter Fitzpatrick)(US Pat. 7,039,677).

9. Fitzpatrick was cited in the previous office action dated 04/04/2008.

10. **As to claim 16**, the combination of Ruths and Guthrie do not disclose accessing peer support comprises displaying at least one list of existing topics of discussion and providing said user with a selector to select one of said topics.

However, Fitzpatrick discloses accessing peer support comprises displaying at least one list of existing topics of discussion and providing said user with a selector to select one of said topics (column 3, lines 24-31).

11. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Ruths, by displaying topics of discussion, as taught by Fitzpatrick, for the benefit of expanding the collaborative capabilities in an integrated development environment.

12. **As to claim 17**, the combination of Ruths, Guthrie, and Fitzpatrick disclose wherein said providing also comprises opening a window for said user to participate in selected discussion (Fitzpatrick, column 2, lines 59-62).

13. **As to claim 18**, the combination of Ruths, Guthrie, and Fitzpatrick disclose wherein said opening comprises retrieving said selected topic from a collaborative development server (Ruths, [0068], lines 8-21).

14. **As to claims 19 and 22**, the combination of Ruths, Guthrie, and Fitzpatrick disclose said accessing peer support comprises determining a context of work for a user of said peer support (Fitzpatrick, column 3, lines 37-40).

15. **As to claims 20 and 23**, the combination of Ruths, Guthrie, and Fitzpatrick disclose selecting from said existing topics those related to said context of work (Fitzpatrick, column 3, lines 24-31 and 37-40).

16. **As to claim 21**, the combination of Ruths, Guthrie, and Fitzpatrick disclose accessing peer support comprises providing a user with means to ask questions of peers (Ruths, [0068]).

17. **As to claim 24**, the claim is rejected for similar reasons as claims 15 and 16 above.

18. **As to claim 25**, the combination of Ruths, Guthrie, and Fitzpatrick disclose said work is defined by at least one of the following: the current file, the current class, the current object, the current project, and the current function (Guthrie, [0010] and [0011]).

Response to Arguments

19. Applicant argues that Ruth does not disclose a "commonality of interest." Examiner respectfully, disagrees. The sections of Ruths cited above clearly disclose a platform in which users collaborate over collaborative objects and resources; thus equating to a commonality of interest.

Conclusion

20. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MICHAEL YAARY whose telephone number is (571)270-1249. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00 a.m - 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lewis Bullock can be reached on (571) 272-3759. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. Y./
Examiner, Art Unit 2193

/Lewis A. Bullock, Jr./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2193